

**MINUTES**  
**ROSWELL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**Tuesday, March 4, 2014**  
**6:30 p.m.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Tom Flowers, Monica Hagewood, Roberto Paredes, Eric Clementi and Marcus Mello

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** none

**STAFF PRESENT:** Kevin Turner, Allison Bray and Julie Martin

**WELCOME**

Chairman Tom Flowers called the March 4, 2014 meeting of the Roswell Design Review Board to order at 6:30 p.m. He stated that there are several things on the agenda this evening but before he begins he would like to wish Allison Bray a very happy birthday today and he would also like to welcome Julie Martin on board with the DRB.

**FINAL APPLICATION**

**14-0010**

**2014-00039**

**FRONTGATE**

**1425 Market Boulevard**

Tom Flowers asked the applicant to come forward and present his plans. He knows that the Board heard this one last month so all the applicant needs to do is to give the Board the highlights of the revisions since then. And if he will introduce himself again into the mike and speak clearly.

Mike Wickman stated that he works for Malon Mimms. The three questions basically, more than anything else last time was first of all to show that the brick was the same color as the rest of the...it wasn't some darker color in behind that arch. The materials he brought showed that the brick was the same color basically as before, that is why he took a picture of the side. The other question basically was how the columns were going to be wrapped and he thinks the design showed how the columns would be completely wrapped around. The design showed...looking a little more like the artist's rendering, which would have made the adjustment basically from that end also so it looks a little more like the rendering. They would make it look more like the rendering no matter what, so no matter what the design looked like, the rendering would be exactly what the Design Review Board approved.

Wickman stated that he thinks that was all that was thrown out there.

Tom Flowers stated that if he remembered correctly, the Board also asked for some final samples of materials. They recognize that Wickman might not be able to bring an existing brick but maybe pictures for clarification.

Mike Wickman stated that obviously from the rendering there are two different colors of the samples and that is basically what it would look like.

Tom Flowers asked Wickman to let the Board know which one is which on the skin here in terms of the colors. The colors are coded here, one is a sight white and one is a sand dollar. Wickman stated that the darker of the two would be the field, and then the latter two would be the trim. Does that make sense from the picture? Tom Flowers stated that it does. On the very front veneer where it says Frontgate, is that trim or body? Wickman stated that was body.

Monica Hagewood asked about where it goes back on the side. Wickman stated that would be body also and one can see the white trim at the bottom. Hagewood clarified that that was just what the shadow would do. Wickman stated that was correct. This is purely shadow. Hagewood stated that it looks like on the side, it looks like that those two panels on the front on either side of where it says Frontgate are darker. Is that not a third color? Wickman stated that the ones on the side are darker basically, but that is the darker of the two but they are not darker than the one...it is the way that the light and the shadow as far as when the rendering was done. It is just the two colors, that's it. The trim would be the lighter of the two like the columns at the bottom would be the lighter of the two and the trim at the bottom and at the top of the top coping would be the lighter of the two. Hagewood stated that where it says Frontgate it looks like that is a lighter color than the panels on either side. Is that true or not? Wickman stated that is actually the same color as the one's on either side, it is just the way the rendering is.

Tom Flowers asked if there were any questions from the Board.

Roberto Paredes stated that he likes the way it looks in the rendering. Can Wickman introduce a third color like where there is the Frontgate panel? It is lighter and has the white trim and then on the sides it looks like it is a darker tone so there is a little more contrast. So, the Frontgate sort of pediment stands out from the sides. Just the way it looks in the rendering. Paredes thinks that would be nicer than doing it all in one color which he guessed it would be this sort of peachy color. Wickman stated that would be the trim. Which one is the darker of the two? That would be the field and the other would be the trim.

Roberto Paredes withdrew his comment.

Tom Flowers stated that to him it was a little peachy but he is assuming that they are picking up with existing brick or something. Is that correct? Wickman stated that was correct. Flowers stated that the brick is to remain because in the rendering, other than the adjacencies...Wickman stated that the brick is to remain. They are not going to take any of the brick off at all. It is going right over the top of it. Flowers clarified that the only remaining brick is on the right and the left. Wickman stated that was correct and there is a little bit inside the column or the arch in the center. Right behind that center arch basin would be the existing brick.

## **Motion**

Roberto Paredes stated that he would like to make a motion that the Design Review Board approves the design as submitted. Monica Hagewood seconded the motion. Tom Flowers called the question.

There were four members in favor of the motion and one, Marcus Mello recused. The application was approved.

Flowers wished the applicant good luck with his project. Roberto Paredes mentioned that the drawings in the second submittal actually made sense. At the first submittal the rendering didn't jive with the drawings. These were a lot easier to understand.

## **REZONING REVIEW**

**14-0083**

**RZ2014-00345 CV2014-00475**

**Holcomb Bridge Road/Scott Road**

Keith Long, 2065 Bushy Run, Roswell 30075 presented the application. Long stated that he has a 34-acre site and it has been in the family many decades, generations. It was a land deal back when old man Martin was putting together Martin's Landing and there is a great story behind it but Long is sure he would butcher it if he even tried to go there. He is going for an R-PUD or a PRD depending on the zoning classification they are in, whether or not the UDC gets approved while they are in the process. Long is showing 100 units right now. The minimum single-family lot size would be 5000 square feet. He is also showing several town homes. The site is directly across from the Centennial development, the Scott Road that is being referenced.

Tom Flowers asked Long if he had anything he could put on the screen to show the Board the actual site, the 34-acre tract. Does he have a plat of that? And this is Long's proposed site plan? Long stated that it was. The Board did not have a copy of that.

Keith Long stated that as one of the few remaining green fields in Roswell this site obviously comes with a great deal of challenges. There is a stream that runs adjacent to Holcomb Bridge Road. The majority of their building area has steep slopes where they are showing the infrastructure and buildings there. The band closest to the stream would be the town home sites and then a couple of town home pads adjacent to Holcomb Bridge Road. The remaining of the sites will be the single family home sites and they are planning at this point to connect to the stub road in Martin's Landing to provide the interparcel connectivity that one is always looking for in Roswell.

Tom Flowers asked Long what the current zoning is. Long stated that it is a carry over. It is Fulton County Agricultural. Flowers clarified that it was one acre lots, AG-1.

Roberto Paredes stated that in general the library is near there, correct? The new library is down south from the site on Eaves? Long stated that was correct. Paredes stated that in general he does not really have a...he does not oppose the actual density per se. But it seems like coming from that neighborhood there would be a couple of neighbors there that would be not happy having that close of a...the lots in that adjacent neighborhood are much bigger. So if one is looking at just a pure number of units per acre, Paredes is wondering if it would not be a better situation to reduce slightly the number of units or maybe have more town homes so that the single family homes can get bigger lots so that the garages are not always dominating. This is a very, very small, what Long is proposing or asking for rezoning is a very, very small lot that regardless it is almost impossible to then get a side garage or basically the front of this whole new neighborhood is going to be dominated by garages. The town homes it seems like have potentially access from the rear so in Paredes' mind he would rather see maybe more town homes that would have the garages access from the rear and maybe the single family homes could be on larger lots. That is one thing.

The other thing and Paredes does not know if the rezoning is going to be site plan conditional or if it is just a blanket rezoning. But in his mind it is a pretty piece of property and he is wondering if there is a way to capture some of the natural aspects of the creek and so that the residents could really benefit from that. Right now it seems like it is just land that is left over either by maybe more back yards facing the edges of the creek or...he does not know, it would be a matter of site planning. But it seems to him that in that location if Long could develop that property and have the natural beauty be an asset that those would sell a lot better and the town homes would sell a lot better too, especially if there is a shared green space. Right now also at the very top of the hill it seems that there is some left over space there that there is no access to and it is sort of like who owns it, who maintains it? It would be better almost not to have a cul-de-sac but just do a loop road so that there is not any sort of little left over pieces of land. And one may lose a couple of lots, Paredes does not know. One would have to lay it out. It just seems like there is a lot of single family lots that are super tight.

Monica Hagewood stated that her comments are the two little, five-unit town houses. She doesn't think that really adds much to it. She thinks that is going to...she knows the applicant is restricted probably by the set back from the creek. She does not know what else one can do there but that just feels like those would be, they probably wouldn't turn out very well from a market standpoint. As one drives by it would look like an odd piece. It would be lovely if they could over look that creek. But she guessed that was too tight. Hagewood is talking about if they had them along that, if they were fronting on Holcomb Bridge Road, the way they are now...it just seems like with five there and five there she thinks that is very awkward on the plan.

Keith Long stated that it is just a very small building area outside the buffers and the topography is more steep. Roberto Paredes asked if that could be more part of the Holcomb Bridge Road commercial instead of trying to make it residential there. In other words if they were sort of out parcels and again Paredes does not know how that would work in the rezoning process but it seems like because there are left over chunks that are better off being associated with the zoning on Holcomb Bridge Road so someone could do a small commercial building or restaurant or something versus trying to make it residential.

Keith Long stated that they laid out different things on there in an attempt to get a commercial site on there but it is very tight. Roberto Paredes asked how big are those two little pods, the two little outparcels. Long stated that it looks like they are probably 200...the northern one is 200x250, 300. Paredes clarified that it was a little less than acre. Long stated that was correct. Paredes stated that they are good commercial sites, one acre.

Eric Clementi stated that he was going to comment on the front areas as well. He thinks that kind of stood out especially getting another curb cut on Holcomb Bridge Road for just five units. That might be a little tough. They are also kind of disassociated from the rest of the development. Clementi stated that he would like to get Keith Long's thoughts on what is planned for the main entrance right across from Scott Road. How that entire area is going to be addressed. Has Long given that any thought with regards to landscaping as an entrance to this subdivision?

Keith Long stated that there would definitely be some identity marker and they would have signage and it would need some development name up there for 100 homes. Clementi asked if Long had the five units there by the entrance would there be sufficient screening for those units from the entrance because those units would have the garages facing right on Holcomb Bridge

Road. Is there a grade differential plan for trees? Because it would be right on the road there. Long stated that there would be a grade differential and a landscape strip that could be buffering those units or they could be flipped so that they are facing Holcomb Bridge Road either way.

Marcus Mello stated that the town homes that are closer to the other houses so when one drives up here, let's say if one turns right, he has the garages but what side is the front of the houses, these town homes? Is it on the garage side or the other side? Keith Long stated that the garages are behind the town homes on the street side. Marcus Mello asked about the other side.

Long stated that the other side would be facing the stream, the creek, the buffer area. Mello stated that there would be some kind of sidewalk to get to the front of the homes. Long stated that in this scenario, probably not. Mello clarified that the entrance would be through the garage court. Long stated that was correct.

Marcus Mello stated that he thinks this is very unattractive. It is like one's front door is in their back door. A lot of town homes, the garage is in the back and then on these, the front is the back of the other house. He thinks Long has an opportunity to do maybe a foot path or maybe something to make one not enter through an auto court basically.

Roberto Paredes clarified with Kevin Turner that if this was rezoned it would be then conditional to a site plan. How much flexibility then would the applicant have to modify the site plan? Turner stated not a lot. Paredes stated that he was not opposing the actual number of units per se but the site plan is not very good and he thinks Keith Long is doing himself a disservice if he gets the zoning. But then he is tied to this site plan and he is not really maximizing the advantages that the site has in order to derive at the most value out of each lot. Paredes stated that he would maybe look at other site plan alternatives and then rezone it based on a better site plan.

Keith Long stated that was okay.

Tom Flowers stated that this was his first time being able to view a topo of the site. It does look like a very preliminary site plan from his perspective and he does site planning. It looks like an engineered solution to fit the highest density on there as opposed to a designed solution. Flowers stated that he recognizes the two. He also recognizes that it usually has to be a hybrid. That one just does not let it be the engineered solution. It appears that roughly 50 percent +/- of this entire 34 acres is usable when it gets down to it. It does appear to Flowers that the front parcels are completely disjointed and that from ridge lines and looking at the topo, this current site plan doesn't take advantage of what is sacred about this dirt. While it may meet the applicant's density levels, from Flowers' perspective it doesn't introduce best management practices, least disturbance to the site for road placement based on current topo ridgelines, peaks and valleys on the site right there nor placement of views. Flowers is a little confused on the western property line, there is not a buffer. Basically, this is a cluster home type community. It is not really single family while it is, it is almost a zero lot line. Flowers asked if this was done to achieve the densities for 34 acres versus 17 to make it feasible to obtain these types of....quite honestly only 17 acres of this is usable of the 34 Long presented to the Board here. And he is packing a lot in it and not taking advantage of what Flowers would consider to be sacred about the ground. Is this done to make it feasible?

Keith Long stated that it was not. It was done to maximize densities. Flowers clarified so it was feasible economically. Long stated that was correct. Flowers stated that still from his

perspective he would have to review it and say that he really only has 17 acres of usable land and what is the highest and best use of that? Not necessarily 34 because 34 of it is an environment. It is a riparian and it needs to be respected. Flowers stated that he will echo Roberto Paredes' comments on it. There is a much higher and better use than this engineered solution of this site. And it could be done rather easily, not opposing the densities that are required in order to reach Long's financial objectives.

Keith Long asked Flowers if that was with more town homes. Tom Flowers stated that he is not sure that it is a hybrid of more town homes or better placement or taking advantage of the topo and the ridges here. He actually cut through the ridge and put it on his house on the top of it right there as opposed to the roads and Flowers has not studied it far enough to start expanding any further on potential site plans. And he also would echo that the front lots, he thinks there are two ridges up there as well where those two sit and there is 110 feet of drop from the peak in the southwest corner to the creek. Somewhere around 118 feet of drop from the peak. Is that correct? Long stated that was correct. Flowers stated that he would have to measure the roads and see what the gradients are what is happening. But, he does think that based on just the sheer topo and the configuration this particular site plan doesn't take advantage of what is sacred. And his other challenge would be by putting those units out front feels very disjointed to Flowers. He is wondering what the harmony is without a higher level of granular detail, signage and architectural relationship. It is hard to make this fit. It looks like Long has come up with an engineered solution to create the highest density and what is the usable...it would be nice to have a map here in front of the Board saying, this is not usable and here is the usable and this is why Long is doing what he is doing. There are his guardrails; there are his limitations of this site right there. He is assuming no buffer zones are required along the western line. That they are proposing residential to residential. That is very unusual even when one is taking this higher level of cluster home and putting it up against what Flowers would consider the true single family would be. Flowers stated that he will also echo the other suggestion of looking at that as commercial out front and creating a nice parkway into here and taking advantage...

Those are Flowers' comments. He asked if there were any additional comments from anyone on the Board about the site.

Marcus Mello stated that he would just mention that maybe the area that is considered unusable could be used like a common area. Tom Flowers explained that the applicant can't do anything within that riparian section other than being done by hand and they can't make improvements. They can make it where it is pathways...Mello stated that if one can have a view, he can make use of it. Flowers agreed that one could have a view corridor, absolutely. Mello stated instead of having homes that are disconnecting making it from farm to creek.

Tom Flowers stated that there looks like there is a place along the south side there and there looks like there is a common green area just within the applicant's own site plan near that crest of that peak right there on the southwest corner.

Flowers stated that he thinks that Keith Long has gotten the gist of the Design Review Board's comments this evening. Is there anything further that the Board can help Long with? Long stated that there was not.

Tom Flowers thanked Keith Long for his time and wished him good luck on his project.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Review comments for UDC guidelines**

Tom Flowers stated that this is an open floor discussion which will be the last call for any comments on the UDC guidelines.

Kevin Turner stated that he would like to give the Board a couple of thoughts on the time line. They have been talking about these design guidelines for a couple of months. The Board had three chapters back in early January. They met with them and talked about that just about a month ago so the Board has had the full first draft for about a month. So if they have any more comments what the staff is trying to do now is get the comments from the Design Review Board. They have gotten comments from some stakeholder groups, from HPC, from staff as far as the engineering/environmental/storm water that sort of thing and they are trying to get that all back to the consultants this week and then they are going to get as finalized of a draft as they can by the end of this month. That will get back to the Design Review Board hopefully a week before their next meeting on April 1<sup>st</sup>. The plan is then that the Board would then make a recommendation of approval to the council on April 1<sup>st</sup>. They are going to have two more public open houses. The next draft, Turner does not know if they are going to call it a final draft but the goal is for it to be 95 percent. There is probably going to be a tweak here or there but the goal is to have it ready to go. They will have two open houses in April for the public and then he thinks they are shooting for May 12<sup>th</sup> to go to council to have it be adopted for resolution. So, that is kind of the time line so right now any major issues, comments...Turner is not sure if the Board wants to go by person or start by chapter or however they want to do it.

Tom Flowers asked the Board if there were any additional comments.

Roberto Paredes stated that he would like to clarify in his mind, the way this is written, these are guidelines, which means that wherever it says consider or should or it is good practice that would be...that interpretation is really left then to the Design Review Board. Kevin Turner stated that was correct. Paredes stated that he was trying to look down the future. If somebody comes in with a project and says well the guidelines are this and he has done this, this, this and this, site connectivity, building massing, he has done this, he has done these porches, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. And then they go, well, you didn't do it right or it doesn't work. Is that grounds then for that person to then say well, I have done everything that is in the book. Where does that stand?

Kevin Turner stated that this is the guideline to lead them. They are saying that these are the materials that one should use. Obviously there is probably an instance where they don't have it or there will be new materials people are using later. That is why they are getting so specific. So, they can come and say, "No, I don't need to do brick or stone. I don't need to use EIFS. I am going to use all wood." And if the guidelines say that in Parkway Village that one needs to use brick and stone, they can say they refuse to and the Board would just deny them and they would appeal to council and council would say, the guidelines say that one should use this. DRB agreed that this is the look that should be here on this project. It is really not that different than it

is now. They don't necessarily have standards that someone could say you can't deny me because not denying it based on something necessarily. One can kind of go either way on that.

Paredes clarified that that in general this basically just kind of codifies and formalizes what they typically would comment on anyway. Turner stated that was correct and a lot of this is for the developers. There are pictures in here for Parkway Village and some of those. They think back to the P and C that came last April. Everyone's comment was this is nice, it is good looking, it would be great on Holcomb Bridge Road but this is not what we want on Parkway Village. He can sit down with them beforehand and say one can see it doesn't quite fit. It is a big guideline for the Design Review Board for what to approve and what looks nice. It gives him some backing but it is also for the developers, the architects and other people to look at before they even submit and say this is what's expected in Roswell.

Roberto Paredes stated that the only relatively simple comment that he has is nowhere in any of these guidelines, and he has voiced his concern about that in one of the luncheons or meetings. He does not remember when. Where the guidelines are built to zones there is very little leeway for accommodating front parking, especially in the commercial or retail areas. He is concerned about that.

Kevin Turner clarified that Paredes is worried about front parking in commercial areas. Paredes stated that he would like to see the flexibility that if one has a retail building that he could park in the front and again it comes down to discretion. But the parking field should really still be in the back but there should be some front parking, angled parking, parallel parking or whatever it is. But one should be allowed that latitude.

Kevin Turner stated that they will have that, which is part of the UDC which is for design reasons, which he thinks would include if one wanted parallel parking to give it a look in the front. They can actually move, he forgets the exact percentage, but the lines can be moved. They don't have to go to the Board of Zoning Appeals and go through the same process. It will be done as part of the design review. So, there is some leeway built in. Having to build two lines in the UDC and put in parking in the back that is all part of the change in direction but there is more leeway built in in the design aspect to do some movement.

Monica Hagewood clarified that Kevin Turner was saying that within this the Board could say that it is okay to put some parking in the front even though the call is for the parking in the back. Turner stated that one can move the building and the build to line if he thought for design reasons...going back to the P&C Bank. If the Board remembers they brought their site plan. Their site plan had two site plans one was because Turner thinks they were asking for a little bit more parking and pushing a line back a little bit. And so, they went through BZA at the same time they were coming before the DRB. That is why the Design Review Board approved two site plans. Going forward there is going to be a little bit of leeway through the design plan to say that some of these lines can move for design reasons and not have to go through the variance process and that sort of thing. If there is a reason to, if someone just comes in and says he wants all his parking in the front and none in the back that is not something the Design Review Board would move for.

Tom Flowers stated that speaking of parking he would like to see the challenge that the Board ran into last week with this type of design being presented. That the front parking left no streetscape or room for it. As a matter of fact they said that they were up to the right-of-way.

They can't even maintain right-of-way or irrigate it. And as a result the properties were inadequately designed, but still by the guidelines, by the current day guidelines.

Kevin Turner asked if that was the Alpharetta Street? Flowers stated that it was another commons just south of there. Turner asked if it was Myrtle Commons, the one that they met on earlier? Flowers stated that was correct. They were required for eight-foot sidewalks or something based on circulation and that was in the right-of-way and it left them nothing for green space, so they argued that they were not going to move their building to lose density, but he is not willing to have green space. It did not accommodate it with their cut off parking, with their street parking that Turner is suggesting.

Kevin Turner stated that a lot of it was driven by transportation. He is not sure what.

Tom Flowers stated that there seems to be a conflict in between transportation, circulation, right-of-way and they are building setback lines. Because they are going to go right to their setback lines.

Eric Clementi stated that one reason they thought that might be is because Myrtle Commons was going to be in the mixed use part and perhaps there was a requirement for a wider sidewalk even though this was a residential property, he thinks that is something they probably need to verify. If that is the case that is really putting a burden on that.

Tom Flowers stated that if that was a requirement then maybe zoning or setbacks need to be looked at to make sure that there is adequate space put in there if they are going to eat up all of the right-of-way.

Eric Clementi stated that he does have one comment. It actually overlaps with the UDC comments. He wants to make sure he understands in particular Groveway. Currently Groveway has a separate zoning requirement section and it also has design guidelines. The zoning ordinance for Groveway is now folded into the historic downtown district in the UDC. Is that correct? Kevin Turner stated that was correct. Clementi stated that the design guidelines for Groveway are still going to be separate and he knows that there is still some area to fill in the design guidelines but are the Groveway design guidelines, which are a little more specific than other areas...Turner stated that they are. Clementi asked if those are going to be folded in to the new design guidelines. Turner stated that the staff is still working on that. It is going forward either way. Kind of the two options and maybe the Board members can give him their thoughts; one is to mix it in. One is to list it as an appendix and just say bring them forward completely and say in this area, see Appendix B, that sort of thing. And actually just completely pull forward the original Groveway design guidelines like was mentioned, the treatment on the street, the corner lot, those sorts of things, the step back on the fourth or fifth floor, whichever it was. He thinks they were going to go with an appendix right now instead of making it kind of its own section because part of it is in the historic district, part of it is out. Some of it is an employment center so staff is not really sure of the smoothest way to put it in yet as far as it having overlapping chapters in the book. So, right now Turner thinks appendix but they have to figure that. He does not know preference thoughts on that. Would the DRB rather see it as an appendix? Would they rather see it tucked in in the different sections in here? Either way works.

Tom Flowers stated that he thinks he would rather see it tucked in. Whenever one has an appendix and he is referencing something else it becomes a little bit confusing and disjointed because no one knows where to go get this list or that.

Monica Hagewood stated that she thinks that is one of the problems they have with the existing, the way things are now. Tom Flowers stated that one has to go to the plant list, and he has to go to this, and he has to go to that and it is pretty....Hagewood stated unless one is doing it electronically where he can link to it. Flowers stated that then they can have it all in PDFs in one file.

Kevin Turner stated that they will have that. It is set up to be linked on their website. He understands. Flowers stated that he understands that there will be some appendix and some references to outside. Turner stated that the appendix would be a part of it. It would not be a floating document elsewhere. So, it would still be combined all in one document.

Eric Clementi stated that most of his other comments are on the UDC. He is good on design guidelines.

Tom Flowers stated that he would like to summarize his comments just for the record because previously they weren't. One is he thinks he would recommend additional images, more granular for guidelines that shows details. While they reference, "use this type" then they don't go granular with the images. He thinks a picture can tell a thousand words particular to future Board members that might not know. If one is saying stone and grout, then show stone and grout at a granular level right there instead of this broad picture that is showing 50 different...he understands showing it from the space shuttle from the 10,000-foot view, from a 100-foot view and then down at a granular level. He thinks their pictures are a wonderful start, he just suggest that some of them even encaption accordingly; reference it there a little bit more granular. He also suggested to the consultants, the Georgia Storm Water Manual and introduced some of the DNPs for that. He recognizes that some of those design guidelines are not necessarily applicable for this Board but they would be for planners and architects.

Tom Flowers stated that the third item was a plant palette that he recommended that they go to the Cooperative Extension Agency at UGA and use the Georgia plant list with an emphasis on native plants. It is updated and once again it can be referenced.

Lastly, Flowers noticed that this whole design guideline is great for planners and architects and should have it all up front. But only about 50 or 60 percent of it would be applicable to members of the Design Review Board current or future. And that maybe a checklist, a very qualified checklist is given to the Board to go down and say, does it meet this, does it meet this, does it do this. Is the site review from this? Does it fall within the overlay? And then that would be a way that the Board could jog their own memories to those. He does not think they will be necessarily reviewing such items as the number of parking spots and setbacks or BMPs that are controlled by code. So those are pretty well set. Or are they going to have additional latitude in those?

Kevin Turner stated not for the BMPs. Part of this is...the way the BMP and the LID stuff came into this is kind of the environmental department kind of sticking a rider on their project. So in a lot of ways it is for the developers and then for code and the environmental staff to review storm water. From the design side, for bio-swailes, bio-retention, one looks at the way it is going to

look so people see it. It doesn't look like it is just weeds in a puddle and that sort of thing. That would be the Board's side, the actual view, not the technical... Tom Flowers added meeting the required footage of the BMP.

To give an example, Flowers stated that if they used a bio-swale as opposed to a level spreader or some other that might have a lower impact on the site or a better visual reference to the site, would the Board be allowed to review that from an environmental standpoint and say no, they don't want a bio-swale stuck in the middle of this town home area. They would rather take this as an infiltration pit to give an example. And say that they want that to be hidden so that they meet the guidelines of interactive pedestrian play.

Kevin Turner stated that he thinks so because again, that would come from the design. If they are both... of course one is going to argue that it is not unlike some stuff they already have anyway where... they argue that they are meeting it and the Board says this is better and they are going to approve it only if he does the better.

Tom Flowers stated that one is a design driven solution, the other is an engineer driven. They are certainly going to go towards the lowest cost. Flowers wouldn't blame them. The most reasonable that meets the minimum requirements of the code.

Kevin Turner stated that it was not like some of the projects they have now where one is asked to do more that is out of his cost budget because that is what looks better and they are thinking longer term while the builder/developer may just be putting it up. It would be Turner's understanding that the Board could say this is the better design, especially town home amenity areas and that sort of thing.

Tom Flowers supposed the applicant wants plant X and the Board likes plant B. But they say it is on X. Flowers stated that the adjacencies, that is a very rustic, organic plant and they are creating a very refined traditional courtyard and inappropriate for it. What happens then?

Kevin Turner stated that they could deny the applicant and they would go back to council. That is where the design comes in, the guidelines and as far as Roswell's environmental department is saying that one needs to use these plants in the bio-swale. And the applicant picks whatever. The Board says no, the property on Alpharetta Hwy., everyone else has these trees; the applicant has to put these trees. That is completely within DRB purview. That is them saying that they want the consistent look on Alpharetta Hwy., one is going to have to change out the tree to match the adjacent properties, the corridor look, regardless of if it costs more. And Turner thinks that would be upheld by council as well because that is a design aspect. So, Roswell's engineering department is looking at the technical aspect, is it BMP? And the Board is looking at whether that is the best tree for the look, is that not the best style? One cannot put the Yucca plant and the Cactus there even if one has a southwestern theme restaurant. They have done it before, so there you go.

Tom Flowers stated that his last comment is that he thinks that the time line that he heard, did he hear Turner say April 1<sup>st</sup>? Kevin Turner stated that he did. That is when he is hoping to have a draft that the Board can make recommendations on. Flowers stated that he had heard a date before that the Board was not getting something until March 28<sup>th</sup> and that is pretty aggressive to expect the Board to review a final draft and comment by April 1<sup>st</sup> when they have not even had a

meeting. Kevin Turner stated that they want it about a week before, the same as they normally do. If the Board is not ready to make the recommendation to that, they can hold that back later.

Flowers asked if wouldn't a better plan instead of....when is the next Tuesday hearing? Turner stated that it was April 1<sup>st</sup>. Flowers clarified that the Board is going to try to have it by the 24<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup> somewhere in there. Turner stated that was correct.

Monica Hagewood asked if they would get any sections earlier. Could Turner feed it to the DRB as they get done? Turner stated that he could. This is the document going forward and then with the Board's comments right now. Some things have already...he thinks this is just what Tom Flowers was mentioning, the Georgia Storm Water Management. Flowers stated that it is in there now. Turner stated that this is the document as they go forward. Whatever changes the Board has, they will look at the parking lot, Turner will get some more clarification on that. He will double check the Myrtle project, which they just got in today. So he has not actually reviewed it yet and work on pulling out the Groveway. If they find a way to integrate Groveway into the design districts so that it will be under DRB that may only take a couple of weeks. He can go ahead and email that to the Board as soon as it is done. He does not have to wait for the full document. Just try to get the issues that the Board is worried about. That is what he means. Any other issue at all that the Board has staff is going to take these comments from the DRB, modify this right here and this is what they will be approving with Groveway pulled in basically and they will look at the parking and the trees as Flowers mentioned. Turner stated that this is kind of 80 percent or so at least from outside of the historic district right now.

Kevin Turner asked if there were any other issues, major, minor or anything, pictures as well. They have to stick some more in there. If any of the Board members see any pictures or know of any examples or illustrations that they like, Turner asked that they email them to him or tell him a building that they like or a detail that they want a picture of and he will run out and get it and he will get it in. They have maybe a month or so to keep sticking pictures in.

Turner asked if there were any other thoughts or questions. If there is anything the Board thinks of sometime this week go ahead and try to get it to Kevin Turner because staff is trying to get this moving.

Monica Hagewood asked what about if not this, is that not...would that be helpful at all. Kevin Turner clarified like appropriate materials and then inappropriate side. They could do something like that. Tom Flowers stated that a picture tells a thousand words. Turner stated that he thinks historic for new construction has a list of inappropriate materials so he thinks that is something that they could do.

Tom Flowers asked if everything was clarified in the guidelines as far as redevelopment, renovation, remodeling versus that because he brings up a good point about the parking, which might not be applicable to a renovation, but a redevelopment it would.

Turner agreed. He stated that if someone was doing a façade renovation on something where they already have the parking lot in front of them, they are not requiring them to rip up the building. Tom Flowers stated that he thinks that is going to be their biggest challenge moving here with the guidelines would be...Turner stated that was correct and that would happen whether they have design guidelines or not. Until they start tearing up the ground, if they were going to demolish the buildings they were rebuilding, then the DRB says okay, he has to put it

up at the front. But if they're saying it is old brick and they are going to put EIFS on it....in those instances they are not getting rid of the front parking lot anyway.

Monica Hagewood stated that she loves the parking behind. There are some retail uses that still think they have to have that. As much as she would want it all to be in the back. She thinks that is idealistic. Kevin Turner stated that there will be some instances he can think of like 1585 Holcomb Bridge Road where they have the slope going in behind them. That would be an instance where for ADA and other things one would probably want it to be closer in the front and things like that. It is part of the redevelopment process when people start knocking down buildings. So, they will see how it goes.

Kevin Turner stated that if the DRB has any other thoughts over the next day or two send them to him and he will keep the Board updated as they get moving.

Tom Flowers thanked Kevin Turner.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

##### **Approval of December 3, 2013 minutes**

Monica Hagewood made a motion that the Board approve the minutes of the December 3, 2014 Design Review Board meeting. Roberto Paredes seconded the motion. The minutes were approved 4-0-4 with Eric Clementi recusing.


##### **Approval of February 4, 2014 minutes**

Monica Hagewood made a motion the Board approve the minutes of the February 4, 2014 meeting of the Design Review Board. Roberto Paredes seconded the motion. The minutes were approved 5-0.

Once again Tom Flowers stated that he would like to wish Allison Bray a very happy birthday and best of luck in her new position with the council. He thanked her for her service to the DRB.

#### **ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 7:27 p.m.

X   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Tom Flowers  
chairman, Roswell Design Review Board

